



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,835	12/13/2000	Vernon Keith Boland	8598	5833
26890	7590	04/21/2010		
JAMES M. STOVER TERADATA CORPORATION 2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE MIAMISBURG, OH 45342			EXAMINER BORISSOV, IGOR N	
			ART UNIT 3628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/21/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte VERNON KEITH BOLAND, KATHY DEAN,
RONALD A. RUSH JR., ROBERT N. JOSEPHSON II
and DENNIS A. PARKER

Appeal 2009-011897
Application 09/735,835
Technology Center 3600

Decided: April 20, 2010

Before LINDA E. HORNER, ANTON W. FETTING
and STEVEN D.A. McCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

1 The Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's
2 decision rejecting claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15-18 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C.
3 § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gardenswartz (US 6,298,330 B1, issued
4 Oct. 2, 2001). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

1 We DISMISS the appeal as to claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15-18 and 20-24.

2 The Examiner finally rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15-18 and 20-24
3 in an Office Action mailed May 19, 2005. The Appellants appealed from
4 the final rejection of these claims September 23, 2005. The appeal was
5 docketed as Appeal 2008-2634 on April 4, 2008. On September 17, 2008,
6 this panel remanded the appeal to the Examiner.

7 The Remand Order stated that, “if the Examiner chooses to maintain
8 the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15-18 and 20-24, the Examiner shall
9 prepare a Supplemental Examiner’s Answer which clarifies the statutory
10 basis for the rejection of the appealed claims and provides an opportunity for
11 the Appellants to respond.” (Remand Order at 5). The Remand Order
12 specifically stated that the remand was “made for further consideration of a
13 rejection. Accordingly, 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(2) applies if a supplemental
14 examiner’s answer is written in response to this remand by the Board.”
15 (Remand Order at 5). The Examiner mailed a Supplemental Examiner’s
16 Answer on January 12, 2009.

17 Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(2) (July 1, 2007), the Appellants
18 were required to respond to the Supplemental Examiner’s Answer within
19 two months in either of two ways: 1) reopen prosecution, *see* 37 CFR
20 § 41.50(a)(2)(i); or 2) request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply
21 brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41, *see* 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(2)(ii), “to avoid
22 sua sponte dismissal of the appeal as to the claims subject to the rejection for
23 which the Board has remanded the proceeding.” According to the record
24 before us, the Appellants do not appear to have exercised either option.

DECISION

We DISMISS the appeal as to the claims subject to the rejection for which the Board has remanded the proceeding, namely, claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15-18 and 20-24. This dismissal includes all claims on appeal.

DISMISSED

Klh

JAMES M. STOVER
TERADATA CORPORATION
2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE
MIAMISBRUG, OH 45342